

UH-511-885-98
January 1998

NEUTRINOS^a

S. PAKVASA
*Department of Physics & Astronomy,
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, HI 96822 USA*

1 Introduction

We can start with the question: why are neutrino properties especially interesting? Recall that in the minimal standard model there are no right handed neutrinos and furthermore lepton number is conserved so neutrinos can have neither Dirac nor Majorana masses. Furthermore, with zero masses, the mixing angles in the charged weak current are all zero. Any evidence for non-zero masses or mixing angles is evidence for physics beyond the standard model and hence potentially a powerful tool. Besides, the masses and mixing angles are fundamental parameters which will have to be explained by the eventual theory of fermion masses. Massless neutrino can be guaranteed by imposing chiral symmetry. Since chiral symmetry and just masslessness are difficult to distinguish at present, one can ask if there are any other fundamental reasons for m_ν to be zero, such as gauge invariance for the photon and graviton masses. The only other massless particles we know are Nambu-Goldstone particles due to spontaneous breaking of global symmetries. If ν was such a particle it would obey soft- ν theorems analogues of soft π theorems¹. Hence any amplitude A with ν as an external particle of momentum q should satisfy

$$\lim_{q_\mu \rightarrow 0} A(\nu) = 0$$

i.e. A should vanish linearly as q . This additional dependence of amplitudes on the neutrino momentum, for example, would distort Kurie plots for beta decay grossly from linearity. Since no such deviations are observed we can rest assured that neutrino is not a Nambu-Goldstone particle. Hence the neutrino

^aBased on lectures delivered at the ICTP Summer School on High Energy Physics and Cosmology, Trieste, June 16-20, 1997.

is neither a gauge particle nor a Nambu-Goldstone particle and is not required to be massless.

Once neutrinos have masses, by analogy we expect that the only distinguishing feature between flavors is different masses and mixings. Hence we would expect ν_e, ν_μ and ν_τ (or the corresponding mass eigenstates ν_1, ν_2 and ν_3) to have different masses in general.

Let me review briefly the kinds of neutrino masses that can arise. Let ψ_L and ϕ_R be two-component chiral (Weyl) fields; with $\chi_R \equiv \psi_L^c$ and $\xi_L \equiv \phi_R^c$ the charge conjugates. Then there are two kinds of Majorana mass terms possible:

$$\begin{aligned} m_L \bar{\psi}_L \chi_R + h.c. & \quad (a) \\ m_R \bar{\phi}_R \xi_L + h.c. & \quad (b) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

These violate lepton number by 2 units and the term (2a) violates weak SU (2) and has $\Delta I = 1$ whereas (2b) has $\Delta I = 0$. The Dirac mass term transforming as $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ is given by

$$m_D [\bar{\psi}_L \phi_R + h.c.] \tag{2}$$

and conserves lepton number.

In the standard model, for example, with particle assignments:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ e \end{pmatrix}_L \quad e_R \tag{3}$$

the electron gets a Dirac mass $m_e(\bar{e}_L e_R + h.c.)$. If there is a ν_{eR} and ν_e also gets a Dirac mass $m_{\nu_e}(\bar{\nu}_{eL} \nu_{eR} + h.c.)$ then it is difficult to understand why m_{ν_e}/m_e is such a small number ($< 10^{-5}$). At least so runs an oft-quoted sentiment (One should bear in mind that $m_e/m_t < 10^{-5}$ and is equally hard to understand!) In any case, m_i for all neutrinos are very small compared to other fermion masses. How is it possible to get very small masses for neutrinos? Some of the possibilities that have been discussed in the literature are:

i) Arrange the theory so that at tree level and at one loop level $m_\nu = 0$. The first non-zero contribution arises at two-loop level and hence one expects $m_{\nu_e} \approx \alpha^2 m_e$ which gives ν_e mass in eV range! Similarly m_{ν_μ} and m_{ν_τ} would be in 100 eV and few KeV range. Whether the neutrinos are Dirac or Majorana particles depends on the detailed model.

ii) The See-Saw Mechanism²: In the general case when both Dirac and Majorana mass terms are present, there is a 2x2 mass matrix for every flavor.

$$(\bar{\psi}_L \quad \bar{\xi}_L) \begin{bmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \chi_R \\ \phi_R \end{bmatrix} \tag{4}$$

This has eigenvalues m_1 and m_2 and the eigenstates χ_1, χ_2 are Majorana. The case when $m_1 = m_2$ is the special one which allows for a conserved lepton number to be defined and gives a 4 component Dirac particle. In the case where m_R is much larger than the others, e.g. $m_R \gg m_D \gg m_L$ the e. values simplify to

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &\cong m_D^2/m_R \\ m_2 &\cong m_R \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and $m_1 \ll m_D$. So m_ν can be much smaller than a typical m_D say m_e .

In this case, i) ν 's are Majorana particles and ii) the mass hierarchy in ν 's is expected to be

$$m_{\nu_e}/m_{\nu_\mu}/m_{\nu_\tau} \sim m_e^2/m_\mu^2/m_\tau^2 \quad (6)$$

or $m_u^2/m_c^2/m_t^2$ etc.

Let me remind you of some specific scenarios for neutrino masses: (i) No ν_R 's exist. Lepton number is a global symmetry and spontaneously broken via the vacuum expectation value (vev) of an I=1 complex scalar field³. The coupling of the neutral field so ν 's give the left-handed ν 's a Majorana mass (m_L). The massless Nambu-Goldstone field is the Majoron. The masses m_ν remain arbitrary. One can also consider the I=1 complex field as a way of expressing a product of two $I = \frac{1}{2}$ "standard" Higgs multiplets. (b) ν_R 's exist⁴. This is the case in some unification groups, (SO (10), E_6 etc). In one class of models $m_L \cong 0$ and $m_R \neq 0$ and corresponds to the usual see-saw mechanism. In a more general case one can envisage $m_L \neq 0, m_R \neq 0$ and the possibility that m_1 and m_2 may be close and the mixing angle θ may be large! Then for three flavors there is a 6x6 mixing matrix and mixing with 3 sterile (I=0) neutrinos.

The current experimental limits on neutrino masses are⁵:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\nu_e} &< 4 \text{ eV} \\ m_{\nu_\mu} &< 170 \text{ KeV} \\ m_{\nu_\tau} &< 18.2 \text{ MeV} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

All of these are direct, kinematic limits from Laboratory experiments.

With non-zero masses, in general there is mixing i.e. mass eigenstates may not be identical to weak eigenstates. In the most general case the mixing can be between the three flavors ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ . For simplicity, let us first consider two flavor mixing between ν_e and ν_μ : with the mass eigenstates ν_1 and ν_2 ($m_2 > m_1$). For two flavor mixing (say ν_e and ν_μ). The standard forms for survival probability

and conversion probability are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ee}(L) &= 1 - \sin^2 2\theta \sin^2 \left(\frac{\delta m^2 L}{4E} \right) \\ P_{e\mu}(L) &= \sin^2 2\theta \sin^2 \left(\frac{\delta m^2 L}{4E} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

for a neutrino starting out as ν_e . Here θ is the mixing angle $\delta m^2 = m_2^2 - m_1^2$, $L = ct$ and the ultra-relativistic limit $E = p + \frac{m^2}{2p}$ has been taken. Although these formulae⁶ are usually derived in plane wave approximation with $p_1 = p_2$, it has been shown that a careful wave packet treatment yields the same results. When the argument of the oscillating term ($\frac{\delta m^2 L}{4E}$) is too small, no oscillations can be observed. When it is much larger than one then due to the spread of E at the source or finite energy resolution of the detector the oscillating term effectively averages out to $1/2$.

There are some obvious conditions to be met for oscillations to take place⁷. As the beam travels, the wave packet spreads and the mass eigenstates separate. If the width Δx remains greater than the separation then oscillations will occur; but if the separation is greater, then two separate pulses of ν_1 (mass m_1) and ν_2 (mass m_2) register in the detector with intensities $\cos^2 \theta$ and $\sin^2 \theta$ separated by $\Delta t = \frac{\delta m^2}{2E^2} (L/c)$. In principle, the intensities as well as oscillation expressions should reflect the slightly different decay widths for different mass eigenstates but this is of no practical importance. The same expressions remain valid if the mixing is with a sterile neutrino with no weak interactions. Since the sterile neutrino has no weak interactions, not even neutral current, there is an apparent non-conservation of probability. In general, to describe flavor mixing among three flavors, a 3x3 analog of Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix is necessary. To describe the general mixing of 3 flavors and 3 sterile states a 6x6 unitary matrix is called for. In this case, the 3x3 flavor mixing matrix is, of course, not unitary due to leakage to the sterile sector.

In general, there will be CP violation due to phases in the mixing matrix⁸. The deviation of $P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta, t) - P(\bar{\nu}_\alpha \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\beta, t)$ from 0 is a measure of CP violation. $P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta, t)$ and $P(\bar{\nu}_\beta \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\alpha, t)$ are equal by CPT. Another way to check CP is follow a single probability over a long time (distance) and do a Fourier analysis. If it contains $A+B \cos \omega t + C \sin \omega t$, then $C \neq 0$ implies CP violation. If $\sum_\alpha P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\alpha t) \leq \frac{4}{3}$ then either CP is violated or there are more than three states mixing. Another interesting test can be done using $\nu, \bar{\nu}$ beams from beam dump or K_L decay. If $(\nu_e - \bar{\nu}_e)/(\nu_e + \bar{\nu}_e)$ or $(\nu_\mu - \bar{\nu}_\mu)/(\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu)$ are non-zero, CP is violated. There are also T-violating corrections in flavor changing decays such as $\mu \rightarrow \bar{e}ee, \tau \rightarrow \mu e \bar{e}$ etc., of the kind $\sigma.(P_1 \times P_2)$. An

old observation⁹ which has become relevant recently is the following: it is possible for neutrinos to be massless and not orthogonal. For example, with three neutrino mixing we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_e &= U_{e1}\nu_1 + U_{e2}\nu_2 + U_{e3}\nu_3 \\ \nu_\mu &= U_{\mu1}\nu_1 + U_{\mu2}\nu_2 + U_{\mu3}\nu_3\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

Suppose $m_1 = m_2 = 0$ but m_3 is non-zero and $m_3 > Q$ where Q is the energy released in β -decay or π -decay producing ν_e and ν_μ beams. Then ν_e and ν_μ will have zero masses but will not be orthogonal:

$$\langle \nu_e | \nu_\mu \rangle = -U_{e3}^* U_{\mu3} \neq 0\tag{10}$$

(Scenarios similar to this are realized in combined fits to solar and LSND neutrino anomalies). Incidentally, the “ ν_e ” and “ ν_μ ” produced in Z decay will not be massless and will be nearly orthogonal! This example illustrates the fact that neutrino flavor is not a precise concept and is process dependent.

If a heavier neutrino ν_H is mixed with ν_e and ν_μ with mass in the range KeV to MeV it can show up in the abrupt changes of phase space as the Q -value in a decay process passes m_{ν_H} . This simple and obvious idea was first exploited in 1963¹⁰. Typically one expects kinks in energy spectrum in β -decay, $Ke_3, \pi e_3, K\mu_3$ etc. So far such searches have yielded null results. Similar searches can also be made in 2-body decays such as $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu_\mu$ for μ' 's of anomalous momenta.

Oscillations of massless neutrinos arise under two circumstances. One is when gravitational couplings of neutrinos are flavor non-diagonal. For example, ν_1 and ν_2 may couple to gravity with different strengths:

$$H_{gr} = f_1 G E_1 \phi + f_2 G E_2 \phi\tag{11}$$

where ϕ is the gravitational potential. Then if ν_e and ν_μ are mixtures of ν_1 and ν_2 with a mixing angle θ , oscillations will occur with a flavor survival probability given by¹¹

$$P = 1 - \sin^2 2\theta \sin^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \delta f \phi E L \right)\tag{12}$$

for a constant potential ϕ . If Lorentz invariance is violated with neutrinos being velocity eigenstates corresponding to different maximum velocities; then also there are oscillations with P given by¹²

$$P = 1 - \sin^2 2\phi \sin^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} v E L \right)\tag{13}$$

In both these cases, the dependence of oscillations is on (EL) to be contrasted to L/E dependence of conventional oscillations.

Matter Effects: In traversing thru matter, the coherent forward scattering of neutrinos with matter gives rise to effective interaction energy which distinguishes ν_e from other flavors. The result is

$$\begin{aligned}\delta H &= \pm \frac{\sqrt{2}G_F}{2m_N} \rho(Y_e - 1/2Y_n) \\ \text{for } \nu_e \text{'s and} & \\ \delta H &= \pm \frac{\sqrt{2}G_F}{2m_N} \rho(-1/2Y_n)\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

for ν_μ 's and ν_τ 's. The + sign for ν 's and -sign for $\bar{\nu}$'s, ρ is the density of matter and Y_e and Y_n are the number of electron and neutrons respectively per nucleon. There is no such term for sterile neutrinos¹³.

As a result of this, the mixing angles and δm^2 's in matter are different from their vacuum value. The most interesting result is the fact that for a given value of δm^2 , mixing angle and neutrino energy, there is always some value of density ρ where the matter angle becomes 45° i.e. is maximal¹⁴. This is true no matter how small the vacuum mixing angle is. Furthermore, this enhancement can only occur for either ν 's or for $\bar{\nu}$'s but not for both. Another related result is that (as long as $Y_e - \frac{1}{2}Y_n > 0$) ν_e in matter has higher energy than $\bar{\nu}_e$ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ has higher energy than ν_μ . Hence if there are lepton-number violating couplings to say, a massless Majoron, then decays such as¹⁵

$$\nu_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e + M\tag{15}$$

can occur in matter but not in vacuum. Matter effects are important for solar neutrinos (if $\delta m^2 \sim 10^{-4}$ to 10^{-7} eV^2), for upcoming atmospheric neutrinos and can be for supernova neutrinos.

ν - Decays: For neutrinos below 1 MeV, the only decay modes possible are

$$\begin{aligned}(1) \quad & \nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta + \gamma \\ (2) \quad & \nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta + \nu_i \bar{\nu}_i \\ (3) \quad & \nu_\alpha \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\beta + M.\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

The decay rate for the radiative mode, at one loop level, in the standard model is given by

$$\Gamma_1 = \frac{G_F^2 m_\alpha^5}{128\pi^4} \left(\frac{9}{16}\right) \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \left| \sum_i \left(\frac{m_i}{m_W}\right)^2 U_{i\alpha} U_{i\beta}^* \right|^2\tag{17}$$

assuming $m_\alpha \gg m_\beta$. Cosmological and SN1987A limits on this mode are of order $\tau/BR \sim 10^{24}$ s. The rate for the 3ν mode depends on whether it is one loop induced or whether there is GIM violation at tree level

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_2(1-loop) &= \frac{G_F^2 m_\alpha^5}{128\pi^3} \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{8\pi^2} \right) \left| \frac{\Sigma m_j^2}{m_W^2} U_{j\alpha} U_{\beta j}^* \right|^2 \\ \Gamma_2(tree) &= \frac{\epsilon^2 G_F^2}{192\pi^3} m_\alpha^5\end{aligned}\quad (18)$$

It is not easy to arrange for this decay rate to be significant. The decay rate for Majoron or familon decay mode depends on the unknown Yukawa coupling, g,

Magnetic Dipole Moment: A Majorana particle cannot have a non-zero magnetic dipole moment. Hence for a non-zero magnetic dipole moment either neutrino is a Dirac particle or the dipole moment is a transition moment between two different Majorana states (e.g. ν_{eL} and $\nu_{\mu R}^c$).

In the standard model, the one loop calculation yields¹⁶

$$\mu_{\nu_e} = \frac{3m_e G_F}{4\sqrt{2}\pi^2} m_{\nu_e} \mu_B \quad (19)$$

which is $3 \cdot 10^{-19} (m_\nu/eV) \mu_B$. With mixing to a heavy lepton of $m_L \sim 100$ GeV and mixing $\nu_e - \nu_L$ of 0.1, this can be enhanced to $10^{-14} \mu_B$. The simplest modifications of standard model which can yield large magnetic dipole moment for ν_e are ones with extra scalar fields.

Double Beta Decay: Of particular interest for neutrino properties is the neutrino-less variety:

$$(A, Z) \rightarrow (A, Z+2) + e^- + e^-. \quad (20)$$

This can only happen if $\nu^c \equiv \nu$ and $m_\nu \neq 0$ (or ν_e mixes with a massive Majorana particle). The decay rate depends on the m_ν and the nuclear matrix element¹⁷.

$$\Gamma \cong \frac{1}{2 \cdot 10^{15} \text{yr}} [M_{GT}]^2 F_\nu G_c \quad (21)$$

where G_c is the Coulomb correction factor, $F_\nu = m_\nu^2/m_e^2 f(\epsilon_e/m_e)$ and M_{GT} is the nuclear matrix element.

$$M_{GT} \sim \langle f \left| m \sum_1^n \tau_m^+ \tau_n^+ \sigma_m \cdot \sigma_n r_{mn}^{-1} \right| i \rangle \quad (22)$$

This is in the limit of small m_ν . The strongest limits on are for Ge of almost $10^{-24} \text{ yr.}^{-1}$. Using calculated nuclear matrix elements this places a limit on

a Majorana mass for ν_e of $m_{\nu_e}^M \lesssim 1\text{eV}$. Eventually the matrix element can be extracted from 2ν double β -decay. With the next generation it may be possible to lower the bound to 0.2 - 0.3 eV.

2 Atmospheric Neutrinos

The cosmic ray primaries produce pions which on decays produce ν'_μ 's and ν'_e 's by the chain $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu_\mu$, $\mu \rightarrow e\nu_e\nu_\mu$. Hence, one expects a ν_μ/ν_e ratio of 2:1. As energies increase the μ 's do not have enough time (decay length becomes greater than 15-20 km) and the ν_μ/ν_e ratio increases. Also at low energies the ν flux is almost independent of zenith angle; at high energies due to competition between π -decay and π -interaction the famous “sec (θ)” effect takes over. Since the absolute flux predictions are beset with uncertainties of about 20%, it is better to compare predictions of the ratio (which may have only a 5% uncertainty) ν_μ/ν_e to data in the form of the famous double ratio $R = (\nu_\mu/\nu_e)_{\text{data}}/(\nu_\mu/\nu_e)_{\text{mc}}$.

For the so-called “contained” events which for Kamiokande and IMB correspond to visible energies below about 1.5 GeV, the weighted world average (before SuperKamiokande) is $R = 0.64 \pm 0.06$ ¹⁸. This includes all the data from IMB, Kamiokande, Frejus, Nusex and Soudan. The new SuperK results are completely consistent with this¹⁹. It may be worthwhile to recall all the doubts and concerns which have been raised about this anomaly (i.e. deviation of R from 1) in the past and their resolution. (i) Since initially the anomaly was only seen in Water Cerenkov detectors, the question was raised whether the anomaly was specific to water Cerenkov detectors. Since then, it has been seen in a tracking detector i.e. SOUDAN II. (ii) Related to the above was the concern whether e/μ identification and separation was really as good as claimed by Kamiokande and IMB. The beam tests at KEK established that this was not a problem²⁰. (iii) The ν_e and ν_μ cross-sections at low energies are not well known; however $e - \mu$ universality should hold apart from known kinematic effects. (iv) If more π^{+} 's than π^{-} 's are produced, then even though the ratio of 2/1 is preserved there is an asymmetry in $\bar{\nu}_e/\nu_e$ versus $\bar{\nu}_\mu/\nu_\mu$. Since ν cross-sections are larger than $\bar{\nu}$ cross-sections, the double ratio R would become smaller than 1²¹. However, to explain the observed R, π^{+} 's would have to dominate over π^{-} 's by 10 to 1, which is extremely unlikely and there is no evidence for such an effect. (v) Cosmic ray muons passing thru near (but outside) the detector could create neutrals (especially neutrons) which enter the tank unobserved and then create π^{0} 's faking “e” like events²². Again this effect reduces R. However, Kamiokande plotted their events versus distance from wall and did not find any evidence for more “e” events near the walls

²³. (vi) Finally, the measurement of μ flux at heights of 10-15 km to tag the parent particles as suggested by Perkins was performed by the MASS collaboration²⁴. This should help decrease the uncertainty in the expected (ν_μ/ν_e) flux ratio even further. It seems that the anomaly is real and does not have any mundane explanation.

We now turn to an explanation in terms of neutrino oscillations²⁵. Deviation of R_{obs}/R_{MC} from 1 is fairly uniform over zenith angle and is most pronounced in the charged lepton energy range 200-700 MeV which corresponds to neutrino energies from 300 MeV to 1.2 GeV. If we are to interpret this deficit of ν_e 's (and/or excess of ν_e 's) as being due to neutrino oscillations, the relevant parameters are determined rather easily. The typical height of production, h , is about 15-20 km above ground and for a zenith angle θ the distance traveled by the neutrino before reaching the detector is

$$L(\theta) = R \left[\sqrt{(1 + h/R)^2 - \sin^2 \theta} - \cos \theta \right] \quad (23)$$

where R is the radius of the earth. Allowing for angular smearing due to the scattering and finite angular resolution one finds that neutrino path lengths vary between 30 and 6500 km, and hence L/E can vary between 25 km/GeV and 20,000 km/GeV. Since the data (pre-SuperK) did not show any L (i.e. θ) or E dependence one was led to infer that the oscillations had already set in at $E_\nu \sim 1$ GeV and $L \sim 30$ km and hence δm^2 could not be much smaller than $10^{-2} eV^2$. As for the mixing angle θ , if P denotes the average oscillation probability i.e. $P = \sin^2 2\theta < \sin^2 \delta m^2 L/4E > \approx \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 2\theta$; then $R = 1 - P$ in case of $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ oscillations and for $\nu_\mu - \nu_e$ oscillations

$$R = \frac{1 - (1 - r)P}{1 + (1/r - 1)P} \quad (24)$$

where $r = N(\nu_e)/N(\nu_\mu)$ in absence of oscillations and most flux calculations yield $r \sim 0.45$. Since R is nearly 0.6, large mixing angles of order 30° to 45° are called for, $\nu_\mu - \nu_e$ mixing needing somewhat smaller one. Detailed fits by Kamiokande and IMB, bear these expectations out although somewhat bigger range of parameters δm^2 up to $4 \cdot 10^{-3} eV^2$ and mixing angles up to 20° are allowed.

If the atmospheric neutrino anomaly is indeed due to neutrino oscillations as seems more and more likely; one would like to establish just what the nature of oscillations is. There have been several proposals recently. One is to define an up-down asymmetry for μ 's as well as e 's as follows²⁶:

$$A_\alpha = (N_\alpha^d - N_\alpha^u)/(N_\alpha^d + N_\alpha^u) \quad (25)$$

where $\alpha = e$ or μ , d and u stand for downcoming ($\theta_Z = 0$ to $\pi/2$) and upcoming ($\theta_Z = \pi/2$ to π) respectively. A_α is a function of E_ν . The comparison of $A_\alpha(E_\nu)$ to data can distinguish various scenarios for ν -oscillations rather easily²⁶. This asymmetry has the advantage that absolute flux cancels out and that statistics can be large. It can be calculated numerically or analytically with some simple assumptions. One can plot A_e versus A_μ for a variety of scenarios: (i) $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ (or $\nu_\mu - \nu$ sterile) mixing, (ii) $\nu_\mu - \nu_e$ mixing, (iii) three neutrino mixing (iv) massless ν mixing etc.

The general features of the asymmetry plot are easy to understand. For $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ (or $\nu_\mu - \nu_{st}$) case, A_μ increases with energy, and A_e remains 0; for $\nu_\mu - \nu_e$ mixing, A_e and A_μ have opposite signs; the three neutrino cases interpolate between the above two; for the massless case the energy dependence is opposite and the asymmetries decrease as E_ν is increased; when both ν_μ and ν_e mix with sterile ν' s, both A_μ and A_e are positive etc. With enough statistics, it should be relatively straightforward to determine which is the correct one. Preliminary indications point to $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ as the culprit. There is also another suggestion²⁷ which can in principle distinguish $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ from $\nu_\mu - \nu_{st}$ mixing. If one considers the total neutral current event rate divided by the total charged current event rate; the ratio is essentially the n.c. cross section divided by the c.c. cross section. With $\nu_\mu - \nu_{st}$ oscillations the ratio remains unchanged since ν_{st} has neither n.c. nor c.c. interactions and the numerator and denominator change equally ($\nu_\mu - \nu_e$ case is even simpler: nothing changes); however, in $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ case the denominator decreases and the ratio is expected to increase by $\left(\frac{1+r}{P+r}\right) \approx 1.5$, (here $r = N_{\nu e}^0/N_{\nu \mu}^0 \approx 1/2$ and $P = 1/2 = \nu_\mu$ survival probability). Of course, it is difficult to isolate neutral current events; but it is proposed to select $\nu N \rightarrow \nu \pi^0 N$ and $\nu N \rightarrow \ell \pi^\pm N$ events and the Kamiokande data seem to favor $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ over $\nu_\mu - \nu_{st}$ or $\nu_\mu - \nu_e$ ²⁷.

The new data from SuperKamiokande seem¹⁹ to rule out all non-oscillation explanations, prefer a value for δm^2 near 5.10^{-3} eV^2 with large mixing and also prefer $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ over $\nu_\mu - \nu_e$. $\nu_\mu - \nu_e$ mixing is also excluded as a result of the new CHOOZ data²⁸.

If we scale L and E each by the same amount, say ~ 100 , we should again see large effects. Hence, upcoming thru-going μ' s which correspond to $E \sim 100$ GeV on the average, with path lengths of $L \gtrsim 2000$ km should be depleted. There are data from Kolar Gold Fields, Baksan, Kamiokande, IMB, MACRO, SOUDAN and now SuperK. It is difficult to test the event rate for ν_μ depletion since there are no ν'_e s to take flux ratios and the absolute flux predictions have 30% uncertainties. However, there should be distortions of the zenith angle distribution and there seems to be some evidence for this.

3 Solar Neutrinos

Since the work of von Weizsacker²⁹, Bethe³⁰ and Critchfield in the 30's and 40's, we believe that the energy of the sun is generated by conversion of hydrogen to helium. The basic reaction is



with a release of 25 MeV. Most of the energy goes into producing photons which eventually emerge as sunlight and the two neutrinos share about 2 MeV. From the fact that the energy density in sunlight at earth's surface is $1400 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1}$, it is easy to estimate that the neutrino flux at the earth is about $10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1}$. These neutrinos, unlike the light, come directly from the center of the sun, and probe the interior in a unique way. The actual energy spectrum and flux of the neutrinos depend on the intermediate steps in the reaction above as show in the Table 1 from the book by Bahcall³¹.

The first and pioneering solar neutrino detector is the one build by Davis and his collaborators. It is a tank containing 100 000 cubic feet of CCl_4 in Homestate gold mine in South Dakota. The aim is to look for the reaction $\nu_e + {}^{37}\text{Cl} \rightarrow e^- + {}^{37}\text{Ar}$. The Argon-37 decays with a half-life of 37 days.

The tank is flushed every month with helium which flushes out the Argon and then one looks for the radioactivity of ${}^{37}\text{Ar}$. The number of Argon atoms is extremely small, the total number detected in over twenty years of running (1970-1997) is of the order of a few hundred. The average counting rate is almost 1/4th of the expected rate in the standard solar model (SSM).

Another detector is the Kamiokande in a zinc mine in Kamioka, Japan. It consists of about 1000 tons of water surrounded by phototubes to detect Cerenkov light emitted by charged particles. The reaction being studied is $\nu_e + e \rightarrow \nu_e + e$ where the final electron emits Cerenkov light and should be in the same direction as the initial ν_e and hence point away from there sun. Due to high background at low energies, only electrons above 7.5 MeV can be detected. In data collected over 9 years (1987-1996), the observed rate is about 40% of the rate expected in SSM. Since 1990, two Gallium detectors (Gallex at Gran-Sasso and SAGE in Russia), have been taking data as well. They are sensitive to low energy p p neutrinos via the low threshold reaction $\nu_e + {}^{71}\text{Ga} \rightarrow e^- + {}^{71}\text{Ge}$. The method is chemical and similar to the Davis experiment. The ${}^{71}\text{Ge}$ decays back to ${}^{71}\text{Ga}$ by e-capture with a half-life of 11 days and the ${}^{71}\text{Ga}$ is extracted chemically. Gallex employs 30 tons of GaCl_3 solution whereas SAGE uses 60 tons of metallic Gallium. The current observed rate is about 50% of the SSM expectation.

The data from four solar neutrino detectors (Homestake, Kamiokande, SAGE and Gallex) have been discussed extensively³². The SuperK data are

Table 1: The pp chain in the Sun. The average number of pp neutrinos produced per termination in the Sun is 1.85. For all other neutrino sources, the average number of neutrinos produced per termination is equal to (the termination percentage/100).

Reaction	Number	Termination (%)	ν_e energy (MeV)
$p + p \rightarrow {}^2\text{H} + e^+ + \nu_e$	1a	100	≤ 0.420
or			
$p + e^- + p \rightarrow {}^2\text{H} + \nu_e$	1 b (pep)	0.4	1.442
${}^2\text{H} + e^- \rightarrow {}^3\text{He} + \gamma$	2	100	
${}^3\text{He} + {}^3\text{He} \rightarrow \alpha + 2p$	3	85	
or			
${}^3\text{He} + {}^4\text{He} \rightarrow {}^7\text{Be} + \gamma$	4	15	
${}^7\text{Be} + e^- \rightarrow {}^7\text{Li} + \nu_e$	5	15	(90%) 0.861 (10%) 0.383
${}^7\text{Li} + p \rightarrow 2\alpha$	6	15	
or			
${}^7\text{Be} + p \rightarrow {}^8\text{B} + \gamma$	7	0.02	
${}^8\text{B} \rightarrow {}^8\text{Be}^* + e^+ + \nu_e$	8	0.02	< 15
${}^8\text{Be}^* \rightarrow 2\alpha$	9	0.02	
or			
${}^3\text{He} + p \rightarrow {}^4\text{He} + e^+ + \nu_e$	10 (hep)	0.00002	≤ 18.77

consistent with those from Kamiokande but increase the statistics by an order of magnitude in one year^{18,19}. To analyze these data one makes the following assumptions: (i) the sun is powered mainly by the pp cycle, (ii) the sun is in a steady state, (iii) neutrino masses are zero and (iv) the β -decay spectra have the standard Fermi shapes. Then it is relatively straightforward to show using these data with the solar luminosity that the neutrinos from ${}^7\text{Be}$ are absent or at least two experiments are wrong³³. ${}^7\text{Be}$ is necessary to produce ${}^8\text{B}$ and the decay of ${}^8\text{B}$ has been observed; and the rate for ${}^7\text{Be} + e^- \rightarrow \nu + \text{Li}$ is orders of magnitude greater than ${}^7\text{Be} + \gamma \rightarrow {}^8\text{B} + p$ and hence it is almost impossible to find a “conventional” explanation for this lack of ${}^7\text{Be}$ neutrinos. The simplest explanation is neutrino oscillations.

Assuming that neutrino oscillations are responsible for the solar neutrino anomaly; there are several distinct possibilities. There are several different regions in $\delta m^2 - \sin^2 2\theta$ plane that are viable: (i) “Just-so” with $\delta m^2 \sim 10^{-10} \text{eV}^2$ and $\sin^2 2\theta \sim 1$ ³⁴, (ii) MSW small angle with $\delta m^2 \sim 10^{-5} \text{eV}^2$ and $\sin^2 2\theta \sim 10^{-2}$ and (iii) MSW large angle with $\delta m^2 \sim 10^{-7} \text{eV}^2$ (or $\delta m^2 \sim 10^{-5} \text{eV}^2$) and $\sin^2 2\theta \sim 1$. The “just-so” is characterized by strong distortion of ${}^8\text{B}$ spectrum and large real-time variation of flux, especially for the ${}^7\text{Be}$ line; MSW small angle also predicts distortion of the ${}^8\text{B}$ spectrum and a very small ${}^7\text{Be}\nu$ flux and MSW large angle predicts day-night variations. These predictions (especially spectrum distortion) will be tested in the SuperK as well as SNO detectors. In particular SNO, in addition to the spectrum, will be able to measure NC/CC ratio thus acting as a flux monitor and reducing the dependence on solar models.

The only way to directly confirm the absence of ${}^7\text{Be}$ neutrinos is by trying to detect them with a detector with a threshold low enough in energy. One such detector under construction is Borexino, which I describe below³⁵.

Borexino is a liquid scintillator detector with a fiducial volume of 300T; with energy threshold for 0.25MeV, energy resolution of 45 KeV and spatial resolution of $\sim 20\text{cm}$ at 0.5 MeV. The PMT pulse shape can distinguish between α 's and β 's. Time correlation between adjacent events of upto 0.3 nsec is possible. With these features, it is possible to reduce backgrounds to a low enough level to be able to extract a signal from ${}^7\text{Be}$ ν_e 's via $\nu - e$ scattering. Radioactive impurities such as ${}^{238}\text{U}$, ${}^{232}\text{Th}$ and ${}^{14}\text{C}$ have to be lower than 10^{-15} , 10^{-16}g/g and $10^{-18} ({}^{14}\text{C}/{}^{12}\text{C})$ respectively. In the test tank CTF (Counting Test Facility) containing 6T of LS, data were taken in 1995-96 and these reductions of background were achieved. As of last summer, funds for the construction of full Borexino have been approved in Italy (INFN), Germany (DFG) and the U.S. (NSF); and construction should begin soon. The Borexino collaboration includes institutions from Italy, Germany, Hungary, Russia and

Table 2: Summary of current data on solar neutrinos

Expt.	E_{th}	Rate/SSM
Homestake	0.8 MeV	0.28 ± 0.03
Kamiokande	7.5 MeV	0.42 ± 0.06
Gallex	0.2 MeV	0.52 ± 0.12
SAGE	0.2 MeV	0.53 ± 0.17

the U.S..

With a FV of 300T, the events rate from ${}^7\text{Be}$ ν 's is about 50 per day with SSM, and if ν_e 's convert completely to ν_α ($\alpha = \mu/\tau$) then the rate is reduced by a factor $\sigma_{\nu\mu e}/\sigma_{\nu ee} \sim 0.2$ to about 10 per day, which is still detectable. Since the events in a liquid scintillator have no directionality, one has to rely on the time variation due to the $1/r^2$ effect to verify the solar origin of the events. If the solution of the solar neutrinos is due to "just so" oscillations with $\delta m^2 \sim 10^{-10} \text{eV}^2$, then the event rate from ${}^7\text{Be}$ ν 's shows dramatic variations with periods of months.

Borexino has excellent capability to detect low energy $\bar{\nu}_e$'s by the Reines-Cowan technique: $\bar{\nu}_e + p \rightarrow e^+ + n$, $n + p \rightarrow d + \gamma$ with 0.2 msec separating the e^+ and γ . This leads to possible detection of terrestrial and solar $\bar{\nu}_e$'s. The terrestrial $\bar{\nu}_e$'s can come from nearby reactors and from ${}^{238}\text{U}$ and ${}^{232}\text{Th}$ underground. The Geo-thermal $\bar{\nu}_e$'s have a different spectrum and are relatively easy to distinguish above reactor backgrounds. Thus one can begin to distinguish amongst various geophysical models for the U/Th distribution in the crust and mantle. Solar $\bar{\nu}_e$'s can arise via conversion of ν_e to $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ inside the sun when ν_e passes thru a magnetic field region in the sun (for a Majorana magnetic moment) and then $\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e$ by the large mixing enroute to the earth³⁶.

Among the detectors under construction is SNO³⁷ (Solar Neutrino Observatory) at Sudbury, Canada. This is a Kiloton D_2O Cerenkov detector sensitive to the reactions.

$$\nu_{e1}^2 D \rightarrow e^- pp, \nu_{\alpha 1}^2 D \rightarrow \nu pn \text{ and } \nu e \rightarrow \nu e \quad (27)$$

i.e. CC (charged current), NC (neutral current) and $\nu - e$ scattering, respectively with energy threshold for electron energies about 5 MeV. SNO can detect spectrum distortion quite clearly and can also confirm depletion of ν_e 's by comparing NC to CC rates. SNO is expected to begin taking data within a year.

LSND and 3 Neutrino Mixing: We have not discussed the LSND experiment in detail. The LSND detector at Los Alamos used the neutrinos from

$\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu_\mu, \mu \rightarrow e\nu_e\nu_\mu$ to look for $\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e$ (and $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$) conversion. They reported a positive result³⁸ with $\delta m^2 \sim (0.5 \text{ to } 2)eV^2$ and $\sin^2 2\theta \sim (1-2)10^{-3}$. The KARMEN detector³⁹ will be able to confirm this result within a few months. If these results hold up, one needs four neutrino states to account for all the neutrino anomalies and hence at least one light sterile state.

4 Supernova Neutrinos

In February 23, 1987, a supernova explosion was seen in the Large Magellanic Cloud. Neutrino signals were observed in the Kamiokande and the IMB detectors. Before discussing the observed signal, let me briefly recapitulate what would be expected on general grounds.

The general picture of a type-II supernova goes like this⁴⁰. A red giant star of mass greater than 10 solar masses reaches a stage when the core implodes and neutronization occurs i.e., e^- 's and p 's combine to form n 's and ν_e 's: $e^- + p \rightarrow n + \nu_e$. Density can increase from 10^{11} to $10^{14}g/cm^3$. The energy released is about 1% of the rest energy released and the process takes place in about 10^{-3} sec. Subsequently the thermal neutrinos and antineutrinos (of all kinds) are emitted via $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_i \bar{\nu}_i$. These have Fermi-Dirac energy distribution with temperatures of about 5 MeV for $\nu_e, \bar{\nu}_e$ and 10 MeV for ν_μ, ν_τ . The number of ν and $\bar{\nu}$ are about equal, but the number of ν_μ and ν_τ are about 1/2 of the number of ν_e . The time interval over which the neutrino emission lasts is expected to be about 10 seconds or so. The total energy emitted in neutrinos is about 10% of rest energy which corresponds to (2 to 4) 10^{53} ergs.

In water Cerenkov detectors such as IMB and Kamiokande, the reactions possible are (i) $\bar{\nu}_e p \rightarrow n e^+$ and (ii) $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e$ and most events would be from $\bar{\nu}_e p$ reaction since in H_2O , the event rate ratio for $(\bar{\nu}_e p)/(\nu_e)$ goes as E_ν/MeV and at 10 MeV (which is the expected mean energy of the neutrinos) is just 10. The $\bar{\nu}_e p$ events should show no directional preference since the cross-section is nearly isotropic whereas the ν_e events should be forward peaked.

The neutrino events seen by Kamiokande and IMB are in remarkable agreement with these general expectations⁴¹. The total number of events seen over about 10 second interval was 19, the energies ranged between 7 and 30 MeV with a mean of about 15 MeV. The total energy in $\bar{\nu}$'s was about 3×10^{52} ergs which translates into 3×10^{53} ergs in total emitted energy in neutrinos. The angular distribution is nearly flat as expected with a slight forward preference and one event is perhaps better interpreted as a ν_e event. A fit to Fermi (or Maxwell) distribution suggests a temperature for ν_e in the range 3.5 to 5 MeV. There was also detection of a few events⁴² by the LSD detector in Mont Blanc and by a similar detector in Baksan, but there are questions about how to

interpret these events and we shall ignore them. I will now list the neutrino properties that can be constrained tightly and uniquely by these few events.

(1) ν_e lifetime: Since the expected number of $\bar{\nu}_e$'s arrived from LMC, they lived at least as long as the flight-time. The flight path is about 52 kiloparsec which corresponds to a flight-time (at speed of light) of 5×10^{12} sec. Hence the laboratory life-time for 10 MeV ν_e 's is greater than 5×10^{12} sec. The limit in the rest-frame is $(m_\nu/10 \text{ MeV})5 \times 10^{12}$ sec. If ν_e is not a mass eigenstate but there is a mixing, then at least one (the lowest) eigenstate should have (a) large component of ν_e and (b) live longer than 5×10^{12} sec.

(2) ν_e photonic decay: In observations by a satellite during the 10 sec period of the SN 1987A neutrino burst, no gamma rays of energies in the range (1 to 10 MeV) were seen⁴³. Since the number density of ν_e 's due to SN1987a was about 10^{10} per cm^2 , one can place a limit of 10^{22} sec on $\tau_{\nu_e}/B.R.$, where B.R. is the *branching ratio* of ν_e to decay into photons. This limit is valid for $m_\nu < 200$ eV even for ν_μ and ν_τ .

(3) ν_e mass: From the data we know that largest spread in arrival times is $\Delta t \sim 10$ sec and the largest energy spread is between 10 and 30 MeV. If two neutrino arrival time difference is Δt_{21} , this can come from two sources: for a non zero mass of ν_e , the energy difference gives velocity difference giving an arrival time difference and there may be a departure time difference δt_{21} ; i.e.:

$$\Delta t_{21} = \frac{R_{LMC}}{c} \frac{1}{2} (m_\nu c^2)^2 (E_2^{-2} - E_1^{-2}) + \delta t_{21} \quad (28)$$

If we assume that $\Delta t_{21} \gg \delta t_{21}$, then

$$m_\nu c^2 \leq \left(\frac{2c\Delta t_{21}}{R_{LMC}} \frac{E_2^2 E_1^2}{E_2^2 - E_1^2} \right)^{1/2} \quad (29)$$

which for $E_1, E_2 \sim 10, 30$ MeV and $\Delta t_{21} \sim 10$ sec, gives a limit of about 20 eV. More sophisticated analysis can not do much better.

(4) Mass of ν_μ and ν_τ : If ν_μ and ν_τ have Dirac masses, then the neutral current scattering on nuclei changes chirality and can create non-interacting sterile right handed ν 's at a rate proportional to m_ν^2 . If m_ν^2 is too large, this happens in a short time scale and ν_R 's would escape carrying away too much energy. From such considerations, one can put an upper bound on ν_μ, ν_τ masses of order 100 KeV or so⁴⁴. This is much better than the laboratory bounds mentioned earlier.

(5) Electric charge of ν_e : If ν_e 's had an electric charge of Q , they would be deflected in the galactic magnetic fields according to their energies leading to dispersion in arrival times. The fractional deviation from a straight line path

$\Delta s/s$, can be shown to be $1/24 (s^2/R^2)$ where R is the radius of the path and is given by E/c QB where E is the neutrino energy, and B is the magnetic field. The dispersion in arrival times is then $\Delta t \sim t\Delta(\Delta s/s)$, where t is the flight time of 5.10^{12} sec. For an observed dispersion time of 10 sec, one can find a limit on Q , the neutrino charge given by⁴⁵

$$Q \leq (\Delta t/t)\sqrt{24[\langle E \rangle/0.3s B]}\sqrt{\{E/2\Delta E\}} \quad (30)$$

where $\langle E \rangle$ in GeV is about 15×10^{-3} , s is 1.5×10^{21} m, B is 10^{-10} in tesla, $E/2\Delta E$ is about 1 and the bound on Q is about $10^{-14} |e|$. The laboratory bounds on Q are stronger but depend on charge conservation and charge additivity, whereas this measures charge dynamically.

(6) Neutrino speed: According to the earliest optical observation, the time difference between the arrival of neutrino and photons from SN1987A is less than a few hours or 2×10^4 sec. Hence

$$\Delta t = t_\gamma - t_\nu \lesssim 2 \times 10^4 \text{ sec} \quad (31)$$

So if neutrino speed is v_ν , then

$$|1 - v_\nu/c| < \Delta t/t = 5 \times 10^{-9} \quad (32)$$

and hence $v_\nu = c$ to within a few parts in a billion⁴⁶.

(7) Neutrino Flavor: If the number of light (≤ 1 MeV) neutrino flavors were N , then the luminosity in $\tilde{\nu}_e$'s would be reduced by $3/N$ from expected. But the observed luminosity was just what was expected, hence if we allow for a factor of 2 uncertainty, then N should be less than 6. This limit has been superseded by the LEP results on Z^0 which put $N = 3$ very accurately.

(8) Equivalence Principle for ν_e : If ν_e feels the gravitational interaction due to our galaxy, then their time delay should be.

$$\Delta t_\nu = M(1 + \delta_\nu)1n(2R/b) \quad (33)$$

where M is the mass of Milky Way and b is the distance of solar system from the center; δ_ν should be one in general relativity. The time delay for photon is given by a similar formula with δ_γ instead of δ_ν . δ_γ is known that

$$\Delta t = \Delta t_\nu - \Delta t_\gamma \lesssim 2 \times 10^4 \text{ sec} \quad (34)$$

and M (in appropriate units!) $\sim 3 \times 10^5 \text{ sec}$, $R/b \sim 4$, $\Delta t_\nu \sim 3$ months, and hence

$$\frac{1}{2}(\delta_\nu - \delta_\gamma) = (\Delta t_\nu/\Delta t_\gamma) \leq 2 \times 10^4 \text{ sec}/5 \text{ months} \sim 10^{-3} \quad (35)$$

Hence $\delta_\nu = \delta_\gamma$ to within 1 part in 1000⁴⁷.

(8) Equivalence Principle for ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$: In addition, if one interprets the one events as being due to ν_e e scattering, then since the time interval is about 1 sec, one can test particle-antiparticle equivalence between ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ ⁴⁸

$$\frac{1}{2}(\delta_\nu - \delta_{\bar{\nu}}) \lesssim 10^{-6} \quad (36)$$

(9) New Forces on ν_e 's: The above result can also be used to place bounds on new forces (long range) coupling to neutrinos⁴⁸. The potential energy between neutrino and the galactic matter is given by

$$E(r) = - \left(\frac{2GE_\nu m_2}{r} \pm \frac{q_1 q_2}{r} + \frac{m_\nu S_1 S_2}{r} \right) \quad (37)$$

where m_2 is galactic mass, m_ν the neutrino mass; q_i are the neutrino and galactic charges for a vector force-field, S_i are for a scalar force-field and the upper (lower) sign refers to neutrinos (anti-neutrinos). Then a bound on the vector force can be obtained from

$$\begin{aligned} \delta t_\nu - \delta t_{\bar{\nu}} &= (m_\nu/E_\nu)^2 (2q_\nu Q E_\nu) [-R/\sqrt{(R^2 + p^2)}] \\ &\quad - 1n\{(R + \sqrt{R^2 + b^2})/b\} \leq 1sec \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

For example, if vector field couples to a combination of B and L i.e. $G = g(\alpha L + \beta B)\sqrt{C_5}$, then one finds that $g^2\alpha(\alpha + 1.2\beta) < 2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2$ for $m_\nu \sim 15 \text{ eV}$. If coupling to neutrino and to other matter is different, then

$$g^2\rho(\alpha\delta + \beta) < 2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (39)$$

and for the dimensionless coupling f_ν defined by

$$g = f_\nu \sqrt{G}, f_\nu^2 \rho(\alpha\delta + \beta) < 2 \times 10^{-35} \quad (40)$$

For the scalar force, which contributes only to the time delay between ν 's and γ 's, one finds $f_s^2, \rho(\alpha\delta + \beta) < 10^{-34}$. If neutrinos from the dark matter in the galaxy, the bounds are stronger: $f_\nu^2 \rho^2 < 3 \times 10^{-43}$ and $f_s^2 \rho^2 < 10^{-32}$.

(10) Secret Interactions of ν_e 's: Any new interactions of ν_e 's with majorons or self interactions cannot be too strong, otherwise the number arriving would have been affected. This is because ν 's can scatter off ν 's in the 3 K neutrino background radiation. The limits on coupling constants obtained this way are typically of the order of 10^{-3} ⁴⁹.

(11) Mixing Angles of Neutrino: Generally no information on the mixing angles or mass difference of ν 's can be obtained from the supernova data. But

if one event is assumed to be $\nu_e e$ scattering, then the matter effects in the supernova place strong constraints on $\delta m^2, \sin^2(2\theta)$ that are allowed, in order that ν_e flux be not depleted. When superimposed on the MSW solution for the solar neutrinos, it disfavors the large angle solution⁵⁰.

(12) Neutrino Magnetic Moment: Before the core cooled to $T \sim 5$ MeV, it had a $T \sim 50$ -100 MeV. If ν had a magnetic moment, when $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_R \bar{\nu}_R$ by the magnetic interaction and the ν_R would escape (whereas ν_L of this energy is trapped by its small mean free path). This would create two problems: one that no neutrinos of this energy were observed ($\nu_R \rightarrow \nu_L$ in the galactic magnetic fields) and the other is that so much energy would be lost that there would be little left in the low energy ν_L 's. If this argument were valid⁵¹, one would obtain bounds on ν magnetic dipole moment of $10^{-12} \mu_{\text{Bohr}}$. However, if the neutrino is a Majorana particle or if the ν_R 's have new interactions, this argument breaks down since ν_R would then be trapped. So strictly speaking, there is no limit on the neutrino magnetic moment from SN 1987a.

For a paltry 19 events, this is a tremendous amount of information on neutrinos. We hope that the next observed supernova would be inside Milky Way at a distance under 10 kiloparsec. Then the neutrino events seen would be in the order of several hundred. Can this happen in the next twenty years or so? Supernova watch is continuing.

5 Early Universe

The cosmic microwave background radiation should be accompanied by neutrinos which decoupled at very early times⁵². The present temperature of neutrino T_ν is related to the photon temperature T_γ by

$$T_\nu = (4/11)^{1/3} T_\gamma \quad (41)$$

which gives $T_\nu = 1.9$ K for T_γ of 2.7 K. The physical reason for the difference by the factor $(4/11)^{1/3}$ is the raising of photon temperature after decoupling due to e^+e^- annihilation which dumps energy in photons. Assuming a Fermi-Dirac distribution a temperature of 1.9 K yields for the neutrino density

$$n_\nu = 115 \text{ per cc} \quad (42)$$

for each flavor. Hence the energy density in neutrinos is

$$\rho_\nu = \sum_i 115(m_{\nu_i} c^2) \text{ per cc} \quad (43)$$

For this to be less than the critical density $\rho_c = 10^4 h^2 \text{ eV/cc}$, the sum of all neutrino masses must satisfy (for $h \sim 0.4$ to 1).

$$\sum_i m_{\nu_i} < 100 \text{ eV} \quad (44)$$

This is the well-known result⁵³ due to Cowsik, McLeland, and Zeldovich.

These results raise two questions. One is the fact that if neutrino masses add up to 10-30 eV (or if one neutrino, say ν_τ has such a mass) then neutrinos can provide the bulk of the energy density of the universe and a sizable fraction of the dark matter (30 to 100%) in the form of hot dark matter. How can this be tested experimentally? The other is, whether these cosmic background neutrinos themselves be detected experimentally?

For the detection of relic ν 's many suggestions have been made over the years. None of them is in the danger of being implemented in the near future. Some early proposal were based using coherent surface effects and detect a net force, on a large area due to the earth's motion in space. This turned out to be too small for detection after it was shown that the effect is proportional to G_F^2 rather than G_F . Another elegant idea⁵⁴ is to use a possible $\nu - \bar{\nu}$ asymmetry to create an effective parity violating force on polarised electrons and look for the spin rotation with propagation. At very low temperatures with all external magnetic fields quenched, this may become feasible some day. Another suggestion⁵⁵ is to use very distant sources of very high energy ν 's and look for Z-absorption dips in their spectrum due to the process $\nu + \nu_{CBR} \rightarrow Z^0$. Perhaps the most promising and practical proposal is the one due to Zeldovich et al⁵⁶. They propose using the volume effect by employing a loosely filled container (about half-filled) with spheres of size $\alpha \sim 0(\lambda)$ when λ is the wavelength of the CBR ν 's and keeping the interstitial distance d less than λ . The acceleration experienced by the container is

$$a \sim 10^{-22} (K_L/A)^2 \text{ cm/sec}^2 \quad (45)$$

for neutrino mass in the eV range. Here $K_L = (A - Z)$ for ν_μ and $(3Z - A)$ for ν_e . Can such objects be constructed and such small accelerations be measured?

If one neutrino, say ν_τ has a mass in the range 5 to 30 eV it can provide 30 to 100% of energy density needed to guarantee a Ω of 0(1). If such a ν_τ mixes with ν_μ by an amount $> 10^{-4}$ ongoing and future experiments at CERN and Fermilab such as CHORUS, NOMAD and COSMOS should be able to confirm that. These are appearance experiments in which if $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau + N \rightarrow \tau + x$ takes place, they can be detected. The sensitivity is to probe $\delta m^2 \sim 1$ to 1000 eV^2 and $\sin^2 2\theta$ up to 10^{-4} .

Conclusion and Summary

We expect great progress in this field in the next 4 or 5 years and hope for eventual unambiguous evidence for physics beyond the standard model from neutrino properties.

The neutrinoless double beta decay limits should be pushed to at least as low as 0.1 eV. The new solar neutrino experiments with rates of several thousand events per year should confirm (or deny) the anomaly and measure δm^2 and mixing angles. Long baseline experiments (as well as Superkamiokande) should settle the question of δm^2 near $10^{-2} eV^2$ with large mixing for either $\nu_\mu - \nu_e$ or $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$. Short baseline experiments at CERN and Fermilab should check $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ oscillations with large δm^2 and $\sin^2 2\theta$ upto $10^{-3} - 10^{-4}$ and thus indirectly the identity of Hot Dark Matter. If we are fortunate we may have a Galactic Supernova and we may be about to witness the early days of an emerging new field: high energy neutrino astronomy. These are exciting times.

Acknowledgment

I thank Alexei Smirnov, Antonio Masiero and Goran Senjanovic for the invitation to lecture in Trieste, for a most stimulating atmosphere in the school and outstanding hospitality. This work was supported in part by U.S.D.O.E. under Grant #DE-FG-03-94ER40833.

References

1. B. de Wit and D.Z. Freedman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 95, 827 (1975).
2. T. Yanagida, *Proc. of Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon Number of the Universe*, ed. by O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto, KEK (1979); M. GellMann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, *Supergravity*, ed. by P. von Nienvenhuizen and D.Z. Freedman, N. Holland (1979).
3. G. B. Gelmini and M. Roncadelli, *Phys. Lett.* 99B, 411 (1981).
4. Y. Chikasige, R.N. Mohapatra and R. Peccei, *Phys. Lett.* 98B, 265 (1981).
5. Talks by I. Nikolic and by V.M. Lobashov, *Int. Workshop on Weak Interactions and Neutrinos*, Capri, June 1997 (Elsevier), to be published; K. Assamagan et al. *Phys. Rev.* D53, 6065 (1996).
6. B. Kayser, *Phys. Rev.* D24, 110 (1981).
7. C. W. Kim and A. Pevsner, *Neutrinos in Physics and Astrophysics*, Harwood (1994).

8. N. Cabibbo, *Phys. Lett.* 72B, 333 (1978); L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* 18, 958 (1978).
9. B. W. Lee, S. Pakvasa and H. Sugawara, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 38, 937 (1977); S. B. Treiman, F. Wilczek and A. Zee, *Phys. Rev. D* 16, 152 (1977).
10. M. Nakagawa et al, *Proc. Theor. Physics* 30, 258 (1963).
11. M. Gasperini, *Phys. Rev. D* 38, 2635 (1988); A. Halprin and C. N. Leung, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* D67, 1833 (1991).
12. S. Coleman and S. L. Glashow, *Phys. Lett.* B405, 249 (1997).
13. L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* 17, 2369 (1978).
14. S. P. Mikheyev and A. Y. Smirnov, *Nuov. Cim.* C9, 17 (1986).
15. V. Berezhiani and M. I. Vysotsky, *Phys. Lett.* 199B, 281 (1987).
16. K. Fujikawa and R. Shrock, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 45, 963 (1980).
17. W.C. Haxton and G. Stephenson, *Progr. Part. Nucl. Phys.* 12, 408 (1989).
18. M. Nakahata, *Proceedings of PPPP Symposium*, Seoul, Nov. 1997, World Scientific (to be published).
19. Y. Totsuka, *Proceedings of the Lepton Photon Symposium*, Hamburg, July 1997 (to be published).
20. S. Kasuga et al., *Phys. Lett.* B374, 238 (1996).
21. L. Volkova, *Phys. Lett.* B316, 178 (1993).
22. O. G. Ryazhkaya, *JFTP Lett.* 61, 237 (1995).
23. Y. Fukuda et al., *Phys. Lett.* B388, 397 (1996).
24. R. Bellotti et al., *Phys. Rev. D* 53, 35 (1996).
25. J. G. Learned, S. Pakvasa and T. J. Weiler, *Phys. Lett.* B207, 79 (1988); V. Barger and K. Whisnant, *Phys. Lett.* 209B, 360 (1988); K. Hidaka et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 61, 1537 (1988).
26. J. Flanagan, J. G. Learned and S. Pakvasa, hep-ph/9709438, *Phys. Rev. D* in press.
27. F. Vissani and A. Smirnov, hep-ph/9710565.
28. The CHOOZ collaboration, M. Apollonio et al., hep-ex/9711002.
29. C. F. Von Weizacker, *Zeit. fur Physik* 39, 663 (1938).
30. H. A. Bethe, *Phys. Rev.* 55, 434 (1939).
31. J. N. Bahcall, “*Neutrino Astrophysics*,” Cambridge, (1989).
32. See talks by the Homestake, Kamiokande, Sage and Gallex Collaborations in: *Proceedings XVII International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics*, Helsinki Finland (13-19 June 1996), eds. J. Maalampi and M. Roos (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997), to be published.
33. N. Hata and P. Langacker, *Phys. Rev. D* 56, 6107 (1997); J. N. Bahcall, hep-ph/9711358; V. Castellani et al. hep-ph/9606180; S. Parke, *Phys.*

- Rev. Lett.* 74, 839 (1995); K.V.L. Sarma, hep-ph/9408277.
34. S.L. Glashow and L. M. Krauss, *Phys. Lett.* 190B, 199 (1987); V. Barger, R. J. N. Phillips and K. Whisnant, *Phys. Rev.* D234, 528 (1981).
 35. C. Arpesella et al. *The Borexino Proposal* Vol. 1 and 2 ed. G. Bellini and R. S. Raghavan (Univ. of Milan) 1991; G. Alimonti et al. (*Nucl. Instruments & Methods*, in press).
 36. R. S. Raghavan et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 80, 635 (1998).
 37. A. B. McDonald, *Proc. The Ninth Lake Louise Winter Inst.*, ed. A. Astbury et al, World Scientific, 1994, p. 1.
 38. The LSND collaboration, C. Athanassopoulos et al, *Phys. Rev.* C54, 2685 (1996) and nucl-ex/9709006.
 39. The KARMEN Collaboration, K. Eitel et al. Proc. of the 32nd Rencontre de Moriond, Electroweak Interaction and Unified Theories, Les Arcs, March 1997 (to be published), hep-ex/9706023.
 40. G. G. Raffelt, *Stars as Laboratories for Fundamental Physics*; University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1996).
 41. K. Hirata et al. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 58, 1490 (1987); R. Bionta et al. *ibid.* 58, 1494 (1987).
 42. E. N. Alexeyev et al. *JETP Lett.* 45, 589 (1987).
 43. L. Oberauer and F. von Feilitzsch, *Phys. Lett.* B200, 580 (1988).
 44. R. Gandhi and A. Burrows, *Phys. Lett.* B246, 149 (1990).
 45. R. Barbiellini and G. Cocconi, *Nature*, 329, 21 (1987).
 46. L. Stodolsky, *Phys. Lett.* 201B, 353 (1988).
 47. M. Longo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60, 173 (1988); L. Krauss and S. Tremaine, *ibid.* 60, 176 (1988).
 48. S. Pakvasa, W.A. Simmons and T.J. Weiler, *Phys. Rev.* D39, 1761 (1989), J. Losecco, *Phys. Rev.* D38, 3313 (1988).
 49. R. Kolb and M. Turner, *Phys. Rev.* D30, 2895 (1987).
 50. J. Arafune et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 59, 1564 (1987).
 51. R. Barbieri and R. N. Mohapatra, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 61, 27 (1988).
 52. R. Kolb and M. Turner, *The Early Universe*, Addison-Wesley California (1990).
 53. R. Cowsik and J. McLeland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 29, 669 (1972); S. Gerstein and Ya. B. Zeldovich, *JETP Lett.* 4, 174 (1966).
 54. L. Stodolsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 34, 110 (1975).
 55. T. J. Weiler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 49, 234 (1984).
 56. V. F. Shvartzman et al. *JETP Lett.* 36, 224 (1983).